



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## BRIEF MENTION.

Many years ago I wrote for my own amusement a little essay intended to ridicule the mania for hunting up plagiarisms; and I used a couple of sentences from it in the Introduction to my Persius xxiii, in connexion with Persius' supposed borrowings from Horace. Among the mock examples adduced was one from Macaulay's Lays of Ancient Rome, and I charged that *vir immortalis memoriae* with cribbing part of the familiar line, 'And now, mine own dear little girl, there is no way but this', from Twelfth Night, Act III, Sc. 2, where Fabian says: 'There is no way but this, Sir Andrew'. Imagine then my surprise at finding after all these years in Mr. SHARPLEY's edition of *Aristophanes' Peace* (Edinburgh, Blackwood) the following note on v. 110: οὐκ ἔστι παρὰ ταῦτ' ἄλλ': 'A colloquial phrase *not* equivalent to the high sounding "There is no way but this"'. Now, old experience has taught me that an underscored *not* means a stab at a rival editor (A. J. P. XIV 499), and sure enough, I find that Mr. SHARPLEY is hitting at what he considers a peccant translation in Merry's edition. But what could be more colloquial than 'there is no way but this'? The 'high sound' is due to Mr. SHARPLEY's association of the phrase with Macaulay's ballad, and the Rector of Lincoln, who has an established reputation as a sympathetic editor of Aristophanes (A. J. P. XXI 229), must have been as much amused at the criticism as I am. But Aristophanes is the dear delight of every Greek scholar, and as every new edition sets me to reading him again, I am going to forgive Mr. SHARPLEY for a number of things that happen to be particularly irritating to an old stager. The genesis of a book, for instance, is a matter of supreme interest to the author, who is prone to take the public into his confidence, as if the public were the happy party of the other part in the procreative process, whereas the public cares for nothing except the finished product, unless perchance the author has reached autobiographical rank, as in the case of Gibbon's Decline and Fall, as in the case of Goethe's Faust. There was no woe upon Mr. SHARPLEY to edit the *Peace* before he consulted Mr. Rogers' 'famous work', and if Mr. SHARPLEY had been a serious editor, and thought the book essential to the proper preparation of his edition, he might have walked from Hertford to London, and got a green ticket at the British Museum. What a striking contrast is this way of doing things to what we read of that admirable scholar, whose loss we have lately been called upon to deplore. WENDLAND tells us in his sketch of Usener, in the December number of the

*Preussische Jahrbücher*, how in order to have a complete set of Bernays' essays that great scholar copied them out with his own hand; and similar stories are told of other professional philologists. Then again, Mr. SHARPLEY informs the world that 'owing to a personal dislike which <he> is not prepared to defend, the asterisk and the obelus have not been used in the text'. All this self-consciousness, all this wilfulness would not be tolerable even in a scholar of the highest rank, but unfortunately Mr. SHARPLEY has a great deal of company in this sort of thing, as I have been compelled to note in so many highly dispensable school editions. The same airiness, the same careless manner of handling his subject is, I am sorry to say, discernible in another performance of Mr. SHARPLEY's, which has just come to hand, a translation of the *Mimes of Herodas* (London, Nutt), in which he ignores Symonds's translations of the *Mimes*, to which I called attention in my review of Mr. NAIRN's edition (A. J. P. XXV 228). By the way Mr. SHARPLEY accepts the ellipsis of κύλικος in I 25, and translates πέπωκεν ἐκ καινῆς in a stilted fashion that reminds one of the eighteenth century, 'and drained the honeyed cup of love anew'. Symonds's 'has drunk at fresh fountains' is much more natural, even if κύλικος be the more plausible ellipsis.

---

'Cupio me esse clementem', though it is hard work sometimes, and I am aware that the kind of flicking criticism, in which I indulge, is not altogether fair. A book may have a positive value as a whole, in spite of grave errors in detail; and the few additional remarks that I shall make, will be at least a tribute to the suggestiveness of Mr. SHARPLEY's commentary. It is something in these days to be even suggestive. On v. 32 he says: 'A great deal has been made of the fact that the collocation τέως ἔως is not found elsewhere in Attic. But it would not be found here, if the speaker were not dwelling on the curse and shaking his fist'. From which we deduce the rule, 'when one dwells on a curse and shakes one's fist, τέως ἔως is in order', a rule which may be commended to the attention of the psychological syntactician. At first, this assumption of superior insight into the mind of a master is annoying. It might be well enough in St. Paul on a ticklish theme (I Cor. 7, 40), but we are hardly prepared to accept Mr. SHARPLEY's unsupported dictum. The area of impressionism is large enough, and he who reduces it does a service, and so I will allow myself to attack this problem in another way. To me the matter is simple enough. Everybody knows that the expression of correlation gives a certain deliberateness to style. So πρότερον—πρίν (A. J. P. II 483). So οὕτω—ὥστε (A. J. P. XIV 240). Aristophanes seldom uses οὕτω with ὥστε, and in the whole range of the language τέως—ἔως are seldom found in correlation. The combination is 'as formal as a lawsuit'

(A. J. P. XXIII 256), and the juxtaposition here gives the line a certain grimness which is better expressed in my judgment by a setting or gritting of the teeth than by a shaking of the fist, especially when one remembers what may be called the 'episiktic' effect of the double sigma. In the same verse I am quite in accord with the reading λάθοις (A. J. P. XXI 231), and as I have not much reverence for the author of Dawes's canon, I should not have felt myself bound to cite his emendation, ἕως σεαυτὸν ἂν λάθῃς but ἕως σεαυτὸν ἂν λάθῃς is not an 'impossibility', unless we can get rid of Ran. 259: ὁπόσον ἢ φάρυγξ ἂν ἡμῶν | χανδάνῃ δι' ἡμέρας, where even Blaydes stares and gasps but submits. See also S. C. G. § 466.

---

It happens to every commentator, I suppose, to overlook a grammatical point when it first occurs in his author, so that the note is not made at the right place, and I will not quarrel with Mr. SHARPLEY for postponing his remark on πόθεν ἄν with optative (v. 20), until he comes to v. 521, where he recognizes the wishing character of πόθεν ἄν. But the oversight is all the more remarkable, because it is this equivalence to the pure optative in v. 20 that gives the only sensible explanation of the negative μὴ which he passes over dryshod (A. J. P. XXI 231). In the note on v. 59: μὴ 'κκόρει τὴν Ἑλλάδα, we are informed with magisterial impressiveness that the sense of 'deflower' is wholly irrelevant. But who wants relevancy in the *verkehrte Welt* of comedy? We shall be told next that Pisthetairos' threat to Iris in the Birds is irrelevant. He ought to have threatened to clip her wings (Av. 1254). —v. 71: ξυνετρίβη τῆς κεφαλῆς. Mr. SHARPLEY calls τῆς κεφαλῆς 'the old undifferentiated local genitive, it cannot be classed under the partitive'. Here again we have a fling at Dr. Merry, who calls it a partitive genitive as do most of the grammarians. If by undifferentiated local genitive, Mr. SHARPLEY means an original genitive that has elsewhere crystallized into a local sense, he may be right, but he has not expressed himself clearly, and it might be well for him to heed the advice of Dionysos: ἀμαθέστερόν πως εἰπεῖ καὶ σαφέστερον.—In v. 241 ὁ κατὰ τοῖν σκελοῖν is explained 'in accordance with a suggestion of Mr. J. C. Miles' as ὁ κ. τ. σ. χέζειν ποιῶν. But why not cite M. MAZON, who says: 'Le scholiaste sous-entend avec raison τιλᾶν ποιῶν. En même temps, Trygée s'accroupit comme Dionysos (Ran. 308, 479). L'expression, obscure pour un lecteur, était fort claire pour un spectateur'. I am not convinced. Nor can I see that 'Mr. Miles's' theory is supported by Lys. 1257: πολλὸς δ' ἀμὰ καττῶν σκελῶν [ἀφρός] ἔτεο. Of course, 'sweat' might be used euphemistically (Ran. 237), but here ἀφρός must be taken literally, as is shown by ἀμφὶ τὰς γέννας.—On κατὰ τοῖν σκελοῖν I said my say long ago, A. J. P. XI 372.—v. 323: διὰ τὰ σχήματα is not 'for the sake of your antics' but 'thanks to your antics'. The chorus does not intend to do

any harm (A. J. P. XI 372). It is not the same thing as ὑπὸ τῶν σχημάτων, Eur. Cycl. 220, which Mr. SHARPLEY has quoted. That is the ὑπό of accompaniment.—v. 1076: πρίν κεν . . . ὑμεναιοί. ‘As a matter of fact’, Mr. SHARPLEY says, ‘Homer never adds κεν or ἄν to πρίν with subjunctive’. He might have added that as a matter of fact, Homer never uses the present subjunctive with the conjunction πρίν. But ὑμεναιοί is optative, not subjunctive, and πρίν is the adverb, and Aristophanes was a better Homeric scholar than is Mr. SHARPLEY. Why the editors are so superstitious as not to punctuate differently, I cannot divine. Certain it is that the Latin translation in Blaydes would have saved Mr. SHARPLEY. πρίν is rendered *ante* not *antequam*.—The proof-reading is not faultless. v. 524 ‘homoeoarchon’ for ‘homoeoarkton’ ought not to have escaped a fairly vigilant eye, and v. 603 we read of an ‘epirrhematising choryphaeus’.—v. 549 ‘bamboozle’ should be spelled with a *u*, if the point is not to be broken off, but while Mr. SHARPLEY has not incurred what Balzac calls ‘le dangier d’estre trop cocquebin’, he prefers to hint at improprieties rather than to bring them out with antique candor. See f. i. his note on v. 712: βληχωνίαν. For ‘depositious’ (ἀποβολιμαίος), v. 678 read ‘depositious’ to match ‘supposititious’ (ὑποβολιμαίος).

---

Mr. SHARPLEY’S note on πρίν, to which I have just referred, is a sad reminder that after all that has been done to clear up the use of πρίν, its genesis and its use, there is a good deal of haze about the edges still. The practical formula which I published nearly thirty years ago,<sup>1</sup> Just. Mart. Apol. I 4, 13, abides for all the Greek that the average student is likely to encounter, and yet it has not won its way to universal acceptance. πρίν with the aoristic (apobatic) tenses is the type. Why the aoristic tenses is clear enough, as clear as the aorist indicative with οὕτω, as clear as the aorist with ἕως ‘until’. Establish a type and it works automatically, thanks to what Ouvre calls ‘la grande endormeuse de la pensée, l’habitude’ (A. J. P. VIII 230). The only thing that really concerns the syntactician is the exceptional use of πρίν with the durative tenses (A. J. P. II 477). Present infinitive and present subjunctive shew that reflection is at work, that there is a distinct notion of a process, of overlapping. One illustration among many. In Plato’s Theaet. 166 B we read δοκεῖς τινα . . . δῶσιν ποτὲ τὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι τὸν ἀνομοιούμενον τῷ πρίν ἀνομοιουῖσθαι ὄντι; In the Symp. 208 B in which Diotima describes the same process, she says: τὸ θνητὸν σφύζεται . . . τῷ τὸ ἀπὸν καὶ παλαιούμενον ἔτερον νέον ἐγκαταλείπειν ὡς αὐτὸ ἦν, where Hug thinks that the overlapping of the participle deserves a note; and so Plato, or Plato’s puppet,

<sup>1</sup>(1) When πρίν *must* be translated ‘before’ it *must* have the infinitive.

(2) When it *may* be translated ‘until’ it *may* take the finite constructions of ἕως ‘until’. Exceptions are found in Iss. and later Greek.

Protagoras, seems to think that *πρὶν ἀνομοιοῦσθαι* deserves a note, for he breaks up the verb afterwards into its constituent parts, and makes sneering use of the periphrasis *ἐάνπερ ἀνομοίως γίγνηται*, so as to satisfy the carpers, the *ὀνομάτων θηρευταί*, who wish to make everything turn on *εἶναι* and *γίγνεσθαι*. Another example of overlapping is found Ar. Pax 85, this time in the subjunctive (A. J. P. II 481): *πρὶν ἂν ἰδίης καὶ διαλύσης*, where some excellent scholars, following the scholiast's *ιδρώσης*, read *ιδίσης*. The scholiasts are not always to be followed in the matter of tenses, and in v. 87 as Sobolewski notes, Synt. Ar. p. 144 (cf. A. J. P. XIII 501), with the later preference for the aorist, translate *μὴ πνεῖ* by *μὴ βδέσης* just as Schol.  $\Xi$  5 commenting on *πίνε* says: *ἀντὶ τοῦ πῖθι*. M. MAZON, in his recent edition, who says that the verse will not scan and cites v. 204, forgets Ran. 237, where *ιδίει* is likely, if not certain. Tr. 'ere you begin to sweat (not 'break out into a sweat'), and so supple the sinews of your limbs' (*ιδίαν διαλύσης*).

---

Professor GOODWIN's edition of the *Midiana of Demosthenes* (Cambridge University Press) will at once command respectful attention. In knowledge of the history of the period, in knowledge of the minutiae of Attic legal proceedings he has few rivals. And then Demosthenes is his special province, and Professor GOODWIN's style ordinarily sober, as befits a grammarian of his school, never rises so high as when he pleads for Demosthenes, the patriot, Demosthenes, the champion of a lost cause. Some of us who have championed lost causes are not so enthusiastic about other people's lost causes and are tempted to subscribe to Nietzsche and to accept Philip as an 'Uebermensch'. At all events, I am not ashamed to confess that my interest in Demosthenes is largely of the aesthetic order. But the interest is keen enough, though it is haply quickened by sundry frank utterances on the part of other scholars. Koch, the grammarian, evidently cannot abide Demosthenes (A. J. P. XIV 106) and Demosthenes was evidently antipathetic to Ivo Bruns (A. J. P. XXV 356). I only wish there were more people to speak their minds freely about the heroes of classical literature, as did the Scaligers and the Casaubons of an earlier day. Demosthenes was a bit of a blackguard and offends the conventional soul of to-day as Isokrates does not. But I have long since exhausted my resources of indignation at the naughtinesses of the ancients, and I am not distressed at Demosthenes' lack of refinement, as Professor GOODWIN is, any more than I take it to heart when I read how the great and good George Washington swore like the trooper that he was, and how he belaboured his cowardly colonels in the streets of New York with his cane and not with the orthodox flat of his sword. Demosthenes, as is well known, outswears all the Attic orators and is not overparticular about the shape of the

cudgel with which he breaks his enemies' heads. ὦ μισὰ κεφαλὴ and the familiar imperative ὅπως c. fut. ind. (A. J. P. VI 60) take one back to Aristophanes again (A. J. P. IV 440). Once in the swing of his oratory I give myself up to him but I do not lose my head for all that, and when the whirl is over, and the flush wears off, I come back to study the secrets of his art, or shall I say? the tricks of his trade, the skilful use of rhetorical figures, the effective position of his words, the recurrent crack of the whip, the sting in the tail of his sentences, the *staccato* passages and the *legato* passages, and the wonderful rhythms. To me as a syntactician, his use of the participle, his use of the articular infinitive speaks volumes. After he exhausts his stock of adjectives, he takes to the participle, e. g. 21, 114: ἀσεβῆς καὶ μιᾶρος καὶ πᾶν ἂν ὑποστάς. After he exhausts his stock of abstract nouns he resorts to the articular infinitive, e. g. 21, 96: παρὰ τὴν πενίαν καὶ ἐρημίαν καὶ τὸ τῶν πολλῶν εἰς εἶναι. It was as a syntactician that I spoke when I said some years ago at Chicago that I wished I could induce some of my audience 'to listen to the long roar of the wave that sweeps the wreckage of a world on the shore or to watch the Titanic orator as he hurls, first one smooth stone after the other at his foe, and then when ammunition fails, gathers up in his mighty grasp the loose substance of the earth, balls it into a weighty mass and brings it crashing on his adversary's head'. There is something of the Megaera in this Βάταλος, something feminine in his fury, something that recalls the Corcyraean women of Thukydides 3, 74: βάλλουσαι ἀπὸ τῶν οἰκῶν τῷ κεράμφῳ. He fights at times, as it were, with clods and fence-rails, and yet it is all planned, and these apparently extemporized weapons are as much a part of his armory as the Chalkidian blades of Alkaïos were a part of the armory of the warrior poet of Lesbos. Cf. 21, 191: ἐγὼ δ' ἐσκέφθαι μὲν, ὧ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, φημί καὶ οὐκ ἂν ἀρνηθεῖν καὶ μεμελετηκέναι γ' ὥς ἐνὴν μάλιστα ἔμοι. And the preciousness of this very *Midiana* lies in the fact that we are inducted into the orator's workshop, that we see all this in the making. The roughnesses of the *Midiana*, its turbulence at which Professor GOODWIN waxes impatient at times, these things are valuable documents to him who is concerned with the artistic process.

---

In Professor GOODWIN'S *Midiana* syntactical matters are usually despatched by a reference to the editor's *Moods and Tenses*, so far as they fall within the scope of that authoritative manual. Very few of the points made admit discussion, and most of them seem to be rather elementary for the stage that a student is supposed to have reached who is ripe enough for the *Midiana*, which is at a long remove from Xenophon's *Anabasis* (A. J. P. XXV 227). But of the limits of syntactical annotation a professed syntactician is hardly a judge, and Professor GOOD-

WIN is pardonable in yielding to the strong temptation to shew how well his *Moods and Tenses* responds to every emergency that he recognizes. And any suggestion that he is too much given to M. Γ.'s would come with an ill grace from one who is equally given to A. J. P.'s. One knows one's own wisdom so well and so often forgets the source. At least I do—and besides, who has the time to hunt up Matthiä and Bernhardt and Rost and Kühner and Krüger and Madvig and Bäumléin and Aken and all the rest to whose stores of facts and observations we Epigoni have not added so much after all (A. J. P. XXV 111). As WILAMOWITZ says in the preface to his *Textgeschichte der griechischen Bukoliker* IX 'Mir liegt gar nichts daran, ob ich die Wahrheit zuerst sage: ich bin Platoniker und denke nur an den λόγος, nicht an die λέγοντες'. But if one reads himself too much there is great danger of narrowing the vision, of overlooking points that are not made by the syntax with which one is most familiar; and in one of his notes Professor GOODWIN has slurred a distinction that seems to be of some importance. 21, 159 reads: οὐ δὲ δὴ . . . τὴν φιλοτιμίαν ἐκ τούτων κρίνειν, εἴ τις οἰκοδομεῖ λαμπρῶς ἢ θεραπαίνας κέκτηται πολλὰς ἢ σκευὴ ἀλλ' ὅς ἂν ἐν τούτοις λαμπρὸς καὶ φιλότιμος ᾗ ἂν ἀπασι μέτεστι τοῖς πολλοῖς ὕμῳ. Whereupon Professor GOODWIN: 'A sudden change from εἴ τις οἰκοδομεῖ. The general relative conditional with ὅς ἂν and the subjunctive and the corresponding protasis with εἰ ἂν are often practically equivalent; and the indicative without ἂν may be used in both without an essential change of force'. But there is an essential change of force. εἴ τις, as I pointed out in 1876, and repeatedly since (Tr. A. Phil. Asso., 1876, p. 2, A. J. P. III 435, Pindar I. E. cvii, S. C. G. § 365) is a 'double ender' (A. J. P. XIX 343). It may be particular, it may be generic. It is the very form for personal argument, for a general cap that fits a particular head. εἴ τις is Meidias, ὅς ἂν any praiseworthy creature, not to say Demosthenes himself; that would be immodest. In short, Demosthenes is punching Meidias as Meidias punched Demosthenes. Temporal syntax of which Professor ADAMS has made a special feature in his *Lysias* (American Book Company) does not fare so well as modal syntax. Professor ADAMS would not have failed to recognize the force of the negated imperfect § 90: οὐκ ἀπῆντα, nor would he have translated § 157 ἐγενόμην 'was made' where it is simply the aorist of εἰμί with definite numbers as in D. 38, 12, Thuk. 5, 26, Ar. Eccl. 277. I am afraid to touch on οὐχ ὅπως (§ 11) again (A. J. P. XXII 228), but an ellipsis of λέγω with ὅπως has never satisfied me. How often is a verb of saying used with ὅπως and how? It is not certain that ὅπως follows ὅτι blindly, and, in fact, any ellipsis is unsafe. There is, however, a suggestion of οὐκ ἔστιν ὅπως. The rhythm of § 149 as well as the language points to a poetical semi-quotation: καὶ τίς οὐκ οἶδεν ὕμῳ τὰς ἀπορρήτους—ὥσπερ ἐν τραγωδίᾳ—[τὰς] τούτου γονύς. Cf. Ar. Eccl. 3 (paratr.): γονύς τε γὰρ σὰς καὶ τύχας δηλώσομεν. A student who needs a note on ἐπειδάν and ὅταν (§ 34) would surely need a note here, to reinforce Demosthenes' ὥσπερ ἐν τραγωδίᾳ.



No more striking sign of the times than the publication of a Latin Phonetic, *Phonétique historique du Latin* (Paris, Klincksieck), for which a distinguished master of linguistic science, M. MEILLET, stands sponsor, and in which the author, M. NIEDERMANN, frankly discards all reference to Greek, as a language unknown to the majority of young Latin students, and cursed with an alphabet almost equally unknown. That is the passing of Greek with a vengeance. Not so much as the alphabet left. Some day the mathematicians will discard  $\pi$ , and if the *caret* mark  $\wedge$  remains, it will be because the world has forgotten that it stands for *λείπει*, and looks upon it simply as an entering wedge. Is Greek after all a 'drunken cloud' that has sailed over and is gone? Is it a mere shape that Zeus has conjured up to fool Ixion? But your 'robust and brass-bound man' has no fear. His cloud like Shelley's cloud is the daughter of earth and water, but *ἕδωρ καὶ γαῖα γένουσθε* has no terrors for him.

I am the daughter of earth and water,  
The offspring of the sky;  
I pass through the pores of ocean and shores,  
I change but I never die.

---

Now there are those who contend that unless Greek change, it must die, that the argument of which we heard so much some years ago, that the truest as well as the easiest way to ancient Greek is through the modern tongue will not hold, that the 'lingo' we find in Greek books and newspapers and letters is a sham, and that the German compounds and the French syntax must give way to something truly alive. Greece itself is divided into two camps and the names of the protagonists, Hatzidakis and Psycharis (Psichari) are familiar even to those who know nothing of the great scholar and the brilliant *littérateur*. The controversy has borne bloody fruit, and some have even dared to die for the maintenance of the old tongue. In this battle of Bianchi and Neri I have neither the desire nor the equipment to engage, and my sympathies are somewhat divided. Every Greek scholar, who visits Greece and finds himself helpless when it comes to intercourse with the people, tries to get some comfort or at least some amusement out of the situation, as he contrasts the vocables that figure in the grammar with the words he hears in the street, and the artificial language of the signs that seem to have been contrived to delude the foreign Hellenist with the actual speech of muleteer and sailor. He jots down in his note-book the various forms that such a familiar name as *Οἰκονόμος* assumes in the *sgraffiti* of Athens—and smiles. And yet there is another side and a very practical side. No study, it is true, more interesting to the student of linguistics than the dialects of modern Greece, but there are few more complicated, and who has the time to wait

until the new and living tongue is born? Who would not miss such a means of intercommunication as the newspaper Greek of to-day? Artificial, it may be, but it lends itself wonderfully to the exigencies of modern life, and the style is not always the non-conductor that the Germans have been calling of late years the 'paper style'. In the hands of such a master as Bikélas, Modern Greek of the bookish pattern can yield the same thrill as any 'living' speech. All modern languages are more or less artificial. When the veriest rustic takes pen in hand, he leaves speech aside. All book English is to a certain extent unreal. If I cannot make out the jokes in the comic journals of Athens, I find it difficult to make out the jokes of some American newspapers that vie with one another in reproducing the slang of a world that is almost as strange to me as the abodes of the multiform dialects that Thumb has sampled.<sup>1</sup> But under the fresh impression of my visit to Greece ten years ago,<sup>2</sup> I recorded some of the thoughts that arose in me on this subject, and I recall them here merely to give a place in *Brief Mention* to the recent work of HATZIDAKIS, *Die Sprachfrage in Griechenland* (Athens, Carl Beck), written for the benefit of Western Europeans in a language that in Greece, as elsewhere, has come to the front as the language of technical scholarship. In this treatise the reader will find set forth in brief compass and with the cogency of an acknowledged master the contentions of the conservatives—which are these—(1) The formation and maintenance of the Modern Greek written language, for all these centuries down to the present day, is a natural consequence of the history of the highly conservative language of the Greeks, and their long, continuous and peculiar culture. (2) The language is not dead, nor are the many apparently antiquarian elements dead, as has often been maintained after the analogies of other languages.

<sup>1</sup> See B. I. Wheeler, A. J. P. XVIII 119 foll.

<sup>2</sup> 'In the perpetual struggle between the waking tongue of the people and the dormant language of the books, the school is on the side of the sleeping beauty—one dare not call it the dead language; and while the passionate insistence that it is not dead but sleepeth, will not recall the past to life, still it is impossible for the classical scholar not to feel touched when the patriotic archaizer apostrophizes the ancient tongue in the language of the disciple: 'To whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life'. The modern tongue is too restricted, too carnal in its range. To expatiate on moral or aesthetic themes in the language of the Klephts does not seem feasible; and in the to and fro of this struggle the school is a great power. Theoretically we may ask, why not let the old language die the death? Why not abolish the old alphabet, introduce phonetic spelling throughout, and let things take their course? The processes are very much such as the Romance languages have passed through. There would doubtless emerge from the caldron, in which the disjointed language simmers, a new and beautiful creation. But it is impossible to reason thus with the archaizer. So long as the language of the people receives the grafts that are made on it from the old stock, so long as the dead tree revives at the scent of the waters of Castaly and Pieria, so long the archaizer will not lose courage' (A Spartan School, in the Atlantic Monthly for May, 1897.)

(3) It is absolutely impossible for the Greeks to throw this written language overboard, and to create another in its stead. And this third point is the practical point to which one always comes back.

---

K. F. S.: DR. HUSSEY has the distinction of being the author of the first *Handbook of Latin Homonyms* (Boston, Sanborn and Co., 1905), which has ever been published. The field examined is confined for the most part to the actual usage of those authors who are read in the schools and the list of homonyms, which is arranged alphabetically, is preceded by an introduction in which the author explains his work and gives an interesting account of the subject in general.

It is surprising that a phenomenon of such importance should have been so long ignored. Synonyms, words of the same meaning but of different form, have never lacked attention since the days of the Stoics. Homonyms, on the contrary, words of the same form but of different meaning, have been adequately treated only by the French.

Homonyms may be homophonic or merely homographic. The homophone is the father of the pun and in Latin the rarity of the one accounts for the scarcity of the other. The few puns evolved by the Roman mind between the time of Plautus and of Priscian were often repeated and, for the most part, have been carefully recorded. The homograph is much more common although, as a rule, it offers no practical difficulty except to the beginner.

But a book of homonyms is not intended as a 'Punster's Vademecum' nor is its usefulness exhausted by those who have not yet passed the stage of linguistic attainment represented by the man who ordered a carriage 'à deux cheveux' or who took 'riz de veau à la financière' to mean 'the laugh of the calf at the banker's wife.' On the contrary this book is the nucleus of a work which ought to be indispensable to the advanced scholar. For example, the 'silences of language' are as important to know as they are difficult to discover. DR. HUSSEY himself says that what an author avoids is almost as instructive as what he chooses. I venture to add that in the study of style silence is often quite as instructive as speech. As an interpreter of silence a complete list of homonyms and of their occurrence would undoubtedly be of the greatest possible value, and it is to be hoped that DR. HUSSEY will sometime complete the work which he has so well begun.